



#91 response
mc
a-26(e)

Applicant: Edenson et al.

Serial No.: 09/170,864

Filed: 10/13/98

For: SECURE DISTRIBUTION OF DIGITAL DATA
RESPONSE

September 12, 2001

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Art Unit: 2161

Examiner: Elisca, P.

Docket No. TI-25667

RECEIVED

SEP 26 2001

Technology Center 2100

MAILING CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 81.8(A)

I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on the date shown below.

Sue Short

Date

Sue Short 9/3/01

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed May 16, 2001, applicant responds as follows:

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on October 13, 1998 with forty-two claims, five of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,674 to Houvener et al. (Houvener) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,919 to Hurta et al. (Hurta). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Examiner has not read the elements and teachings of the prior art onto the specific elements and limitations of Claim 1. For example, the Examiner equates Houvener's use of a "point of verification terminal" which "comprises a standard magnetic strip reader 4, an optional bar code reader 4', a check scanner 4", all of which are well known in the prior art" (column 5, lines 15-20 of Houvener) to the recited "media player." The Examiner then equates, "The credit approval code would be displayed either on the display means 6 of the point of verification terminal or, in the alternative, on an optional second display means 6'" (column